

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending and stand rejected for the reasons set forth in the Office Action of March 18, 2008. Briefly the claims are rejected as follows: Claims 1-11, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over US 2002/0061770 ("Ozaki") in view of US 6445932 ("Soini"); and claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Soini as applied to claim 7 and further in view of US 6094565 ("Alberth"). Claims 15 and 16 are new.

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the Interview conducted on June 26, 2008, and concurs with the description of the interview in the Examiner's Interview Summary of July 1, 2008. However, Applicant continues to disagree that Soini in combination with Ozaki renders the pending claims obvious. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 7 to further distinguish the pending claims over the cited prior art.

Claim 1, as amended, now recites, *inter alia*, "a main operation section," "a housing having a single, main display section," "an auxiliary operation section comprising at least one key" and "wherein said auxiliary operation section is inoperative at least in the opened state and operative only in the closed state to at least one of navigate and view information displayed on the main display section in the closed state." Claim 7, similarly recites, *inter alia*, "a main operation section," "[a housing having] a single, main display section displaying screens according to the operation of said main operation section," "an auxiliary operation section comprising at least one key" and "wherein said at least one key is inoperative at least in an opened state but operative only in a closed state." Claims 1 and 7 as currently drafted, and their

dependent claims, are not rendered obvious over the cited art inasmuch as the cited art fails to disclose each of those claimed elements in combination.

Soini and Ozaki the principal references relied upon by the Examiner fails to disclose all the claimed elements. As discussed during the interview, Soini is directed to a portable terminal that utilizes two separate display sections, display section 11 that is visible and active only in the closed position and display section 15 that is visible and active only in the opened position. Both the display section (15) and the display section (11) are switched from active to inactive in accordance with the opening and closing of the portable terminal. Also, the operation section (12) is operative with the display section (11) and the operation section (22) is operative with the display section (15). Ozaki shows a single display, but does not disclose an auxiliary operating section that is operative only in a closed state.

In contrast, the portable terminal of claims 1 and 7, and the claims dependent thereon, require a "single main display section" that is on in both the open and closed state. In addition, claims 1 and 7 further require, respectively, that "said auxiliary operation section is inoperative at least in the opened state and operative only in the closed state to at least one of navigate and view information displayed on the main display section in the closed state" and "said at least one key is inoperative at least in an opened state but operative only in a closed state wherein both of said housings relatively rotate 180° from the closed state." None of the cited references disclose this claimed aspect of claims 1 and 7 and their dependent claims. To simplify the explanation of the differences between the pending claims and Ozaki and Soini, Applicant provides the below tables that show the state of the main display section and the state of the auxiliary operation section/at least one key in each of claims 1 and 7, Ozaki and Soini. "ON" means that a display section is in an active state, and means that an auxiliary operation

section is in an active state. "OFF" means that a display section is not in an active state, and means that an auxiliary operation section is not in an active state.

Table (1)

Claims 1 and 7	Open State	Closed State
Main display section (106)	ON	ON
Auxiliary operation section (103)	OFF	ON

Table (2)

Ozaki (US 2002/0061770)	Opened State	Closed State
Display section (3)	ON	ON
Operation section (8)	ON	ON

Table (3)

Soini (US 6,445,932)	Opened State	Closed State
Display section (11)	OFF	ON
Operation section (12)	OFF	ON

Table (4)

Soini (US 6,445,932)	Opened State	Closed State
Display section (15)	ON	OFF
Operation section (22)	ON	OFF

Table (5)

Soini (US 6,445,932)	Opened State	Closed State
Display section (15)	ON	OFF
Operation section (12)	OFF	ON

Table (6)

Soini (US 6,445,932)	Opened State	Closed State
Display section (11)	OFF	ON
Operation section (22)	ON	OFF

As illustrated in the tables above, the cited prior art fails to disclose the claimed combination of independent claims 1 and 7 and their dependent claims. While Ozaki discloses a mobile terminal that has one screen, it does not have an auxiliary operation section that is only on in the closed state. Unlike the amended claims, Soini discloses two display sections, each of which operates independently of the other and under the control of separate operation sections. Each display section and corresponding operation section are on or off as set forth in tables 3-6, above. Thus, Ozaki and Soini fail to disclose the claimed combinations.

Claim 15, while new, is also not rendered obvious by the cited art for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 7 are not rendered obvious. In particular, none of the prior art cited by the Examiner discloses or suggests a portable terminal “wherein when the first housing is moved from the closed position to the opened position, the main display section is kept active while the auxiliary section for the main display section is switched from active to inactive.” As discussed, Soini discloses a two display portable terminal having a first display that is active in the closed state (and inactive in the opened state) and a second display that is active in the

opened state (and inactive in the closed state). In other words, Soini does not disclose a main display section that "is kept active while the auxiliary section for the main display section is switched from active to inactive." Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and, therefore, is not rendered obvious by the cited art for at least the same reasons that claims 16 is not rendered obvious.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider these rejections in view of the amendments and the comments as set forth above and allow pending claims 1-16.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that this patent application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested. The Examiner is urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel at the number noted below if it will advance the prosecution of this application, or with any suggestion to resolve any condition that would impede allowance. In the event that any extension of time is required, Applicant petitions for that extension of time required to make this response timely. Kindly charge any additional fee, or credit any surplus, to Deposit Account No. 50-0675, Order No. 848075-0059.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 18, 2008



John C. Garces
Reg. No. 40,616
Schulte Roth & Zabel, LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Tel.: (212) 756-2215